DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 032 157 RC 003 587

By-Ruesink, David C.; And Others

Relocating Mexican Americans Who Have Been Retrained.

Spons Agency-Texas Agricultural Experiment Station, College Station.
Pub Date 28 Aug 69
Note-14p.; Paper presented at Rural Sociological Society Meeting (San Francisco, California, August 28-31, 1969)
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.80
Descriptors-Adjustment Problems, Labor Problems, Labor Turnover, Metropolitan Areas, *Mexican Americans, Occupational Mobility, *Participant Characteristics, *Program Evaluation, *Relocation, Rural Areas, Social Factors, Socioeconomic Influences, *Vocational Retraining

A project involving the cooperative effort of the Ling-Temco-Vought Corporation and governmental agencies relocated 684 South Texans to metropolitan areas for work as aircraft assemblers after a four-week training program in the Lower Rio Grande Valley. About 90% of these relocatees were Mexican Americans. Sixteen months after the first families were relocated and four months after the last families were relocated there were 75.58% of the trainees still on the job. The purpose of this project was to study the adjustment which takes place as a result of retraining and relocation, and to determine what sociological factors represented the best predictors for success in the program including retention after retraining. Education level and previous occupation proved to be the best predictors of success in the program. The major conclusion drawn from the study was that selected external factors are usable as predictors of ability to retrain and relocate, but conclusions based on a priori conditions are at best tentative. (DK)

ED032157

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

RELOCATING MEXICAN AMERICANS WHO HAVE BEEN RETRAINED*

David C. Ruesink, T. Brice Batson, Michael Kleibrink

In order to bring about a balance between areas of high unemployment and areas with heavy labor demands, several labor mobility projects have been attempted. The success of these programs varies greatly.

Up to the present time, one of the most successful programs is a Texas mobility project. The pilot project, involving cooperative efforts between private industry and governmental agencies, was established to determine the feasibility of moving approximately 750 South Texans to metropolitan areas for work.

The attempt in this study is to see whether there are any predictors for longer retention after relocation. Omari (1956) reported that socioeconomic status was one of the best indicators of adjustment of Negroes, but Shannon and Lettau (1963) suggested that there was little relation between external factors and adjustment of Mexican Americans. In view of these conflicting reports, the objective of this paper is to analyze basic characteristics of the workers who have remained at least 6 months (denoted employees in this paper) and those who have terminated and returned to the supply area (terminals). Data for this analysis were obtained from Texas Employment Commission Questionnaires.

---

*Paper presented at the Rural Sociological Society Meeting in San Francisco, California, August 28, 1969. The development of this report was supported by the Texas Agricultural Experiment Station and the State Research Service Project G-1716.

RC 003587

Procedures

On October 7, 1967, and each week for the next 52 weeks, a class of fifteen South Texans began a four-week training program in the Lower Rio Grande Valley to become aircraft assemblers. Training, which was at one of three centers located in Harlingen, McAllen, and Rio Grande City, was conducted by instructors from Vought Aeronautics Division of Ling-Temco-Vought Corporation (LTV). Upon successful completion of the training, 684 workers (denoted relocatees) and their families were relocated in the Dallas-Fort Worth area and started industrial work in Grand Prairie, Texas. About 90 percent of these relocatees were Mexican Americans.

Sixty days after beginning as aircraft assemblers, 93 percent were still on the job. Ruesink and Batson (1969) suggest that some factors contributing to the high retention rate after 60 days are: 1) careful screening of potential employees, 2) training in the area where surplus labor is located, 3) training for specific needs of a particular firm, 4) providing counseling during training as well as after being relocated, 5) providing money to pay expenses, and 6) assisting relocatees with finding a place to stay after arrival in the metropolitan center.

However, figures collected at the end of 60 days on the new job may result in a misinterpretation of "success". As of February 1, 1969, which was 16 months after the first families were relocated and four months after the last families were relocated, there were 75.58% of the relocatees still on the job. This means that roughly one-fourth of the relocatees left their jobs and either stayed in the demand area, returned to the supply area, or migrated to some third area.

For detailed analysis, a sample of 164 of the 684 relocatees with portions from each of the three training centers was selected in order to study the adjustment which takes place as a result of retraining and relocation. As of February 1,

1969, a total of 116 were still on the job, 37 had returned to the Valley, and 11 had changed jobs, either staying in the demand area or moving to another town outside of the supply area. This represents a retention rate of 71.34%. Thus, the differentiation in retention rates between the population and the sample is about four percent.

Findings

Educational Level

A major factor affecting the ability of a person to relocate is the calibre of the individual involved. Through careful screening, relocatees who participated in the LTV project have personal characteristics which rank above the average South Texas resident. More than 40% of the relocatees completed high school and several took college courses. Considering that nine out of ten relocatees are Mexican Americans, these figures take on different meaning when one notes that in 1960 the median educational level for males age 25 and over from the four county supply area was 6.8 years (Census, 1960) while Texans with Spanish surnames completed 6.1 years (Upham and Wright, 1966). Furthermore, 55.48% (Census, 1960) of the total population in the supply area had less than an eighth grade education (Table 1).

When a comparison is made between employees and terminals, a higher percentage of employees completed high school than did the terminals (42% compared to 27%). The median educational level for employees is 11.6 years compared to 9.6 years for the terminals.

Table 1. Percentage Distribution of Last Grade Completed.

Last Grade Completed	Employees (116)	Terminals (37)	South Texas Males* 25 and over (77,464)	1968 National Projects
None	...	...	17.62	
1-4	...	...	23.01	
5 & 6	9.48	8.11	10.44	
7	6.90	10.81	4.41	
8	8.62	21.62	6.95	
9-11	28.45	29.73	10.35	
12	42.24	27.03	13.01	
13-15	2.59	2.70	7.33	
16 or more	0.00	0.00	6.80	
Not given	1.72	0.00	.08	
MEDIAN	11.60	9.58	6.80	10.4**

*All South Texas data refers to the four county supply area (1960 U.S. Census).
**Montross refers to this classification as average.

Prior Employment

Another indication of the high calibre individual who was relocated is the analysis of prior employment (Table 2). Slightly under 20 percent of the relocatees had occupations in agriculture, forestry, or fishery as their last regular employment. A higher percentage of terminals than employees were classified as unskilled or entries on their last job. This difference may be a prime factor in the success of the LTV project. The percentage distribution of primary occupations

Table 2. Percentage Distribution of Occupations on Last Regular Job.

Occupational Category	Employees (116)	Terminals (37)	1968 National Projects
1. Professional and Managerial	6.0	8.1	2.7
2. Clerical and Sales	13.8	16.2	6.8
3. Service	16.4	10.8	10.5
4. Agricultural, Forestry, and Fishing	17.2	16.2	3.7
5. Industrial and Crafts	20.8	8.1	26.0
6. Unskilled and Entries	25.9	40.5	50.3

(Table 3) reveals a marked difference between those involved in agriculture for the four supply counties and those involved in the LTV project. This, coupled with the last occupation prior to relocation shown in Table 2, indicates that farm laborers are seldom involved in relocation projects.

Slight differences in retention occur in the service category as well as the unskilled and entry category. A further breakdown of the industrial and crafts category indicates, as would be expected, that those persons who list structural work as their primary occupation have a greater tendency to remain employed as aircraft assemblers.

Table 3. Percentage Distribution of Primary Occupations.

Occupational Category	Employees (116)	Terminals (37)	South Texas Males (77,819)
1. Professional and Managerial	5.2	5.4	17.2
2. Clerical and Sales	19.8	18.9	9.1
3. Service	6.0	2.7	4.8
4. Agricultural, Forestry, and Fishing	8.6	5.4	27.0
5. Industrial and Crafts	29.3	29.7	30.2
Machines	7.8	8.1	...
Bench Work	1.7	5.4	...
Structural	19.8	16.2	...
6. Unskilled and Entries	31.0	37.8	11.7

Also indicative of the differentiation between employees and terminals is the average wage earned on the last job. Analysis shows that employees received an hourly wage on their last job which is 14 cents more than earned by terminals (Table 4). Yet this is still 23 cents per hour under the hourly wage received by all the 1968 projects combined.

Table 4. Average Wage Earned on the Last Job.

	Employees (116)	Terminals (37)	1968 National Projects
Average Wage Earned on Last Job	$1.57	$1.43	$1.80

Age and Marital Status

There is little difference in the average age or marital status of employees compared to terminals (Table 5); however, the average for both the LTV project and the 1968 projects is higher than the average-median age for the counties involved. There is a higher percentage of married men involved in the LTV project than for the total 1968 projects.

Table 5. Age and Marital Status.

	Employees (116)	Terminals (37)	South Texas Males (182,961)	1968 National Projects
Average Age	25.8	24.7	19.5[a]	26.4
Percent Married	66.4	67.6	64.2[b]	50.1

[a]Mean-Median
[b]For those 14 and over

Family Size

Other factors that play important parts in the ability to relocate are the number of children that a family has and whether the children attend school (Table 6). Those persons with no children have fewer terminations than those who have one or two children. This may be directly related to the fact that many landlords refuse

to rent to people with small children; thus, satisfactory housing becomes difficult to locate. Yet, families with six or more children have the best relocation record. Those with several children may not have the money to return to the Valley or may have a stronger economic motivation for remaining employed.

Table 6. Percentage Distribution of Number of Children Under 18.

Number of Children Under 18	Employees (116)	Terminals (37)
None	49.1	37.8
1	13.8	27.0
2	11.2	10.8
3	12.9	13.5
4	6.0	8.1
5	1.7	2.7
6	4.3	0.0
7	0.0	0.0
8	.9	0.0
9 or more	0.0	0.0

Welfare and Unemployment

It has been assumed that such schemes as the LTV project will take people off welfare. Our analyses, however, show that at the time of initial screening only one relocatee in the 153 was receiving welfare (Table 7). Indications are that individuals who are receiving welfare are either not attracted to or are ineligible for relocation programs. This negates the myth that those receiving welfare would be switched from tax receivers to tax payers.

Even though about one out of five relocatees was receiving unemployment compensation at the time of initial screening, there is little difference between employees and terminals in this respect (Table 7), but the direction is as would be expected. Most employees who received unemployment prior to relocation were working for larger companies and, therefore,

Table 7. Percentage Receiving Unemployment and Welfare.

	Employees (116)	Terminals (37)	1968 National Projects
Percent Receiving Unemployment	25.00	18.90	19.40
Percent Receiving Welfare	.09	0.00	17.30

were more familiar with a similar work situation as found with LTV. However, analysis of the number of weeks in the last year that a relocatee was employed shows that those persons who were unemployed less than twenty weeks tend to relocate more successfully than do those who were unemployed for more than forty weeks (Table 8). In short, this suggests that unemployment may become a way of life after a period of time.

Table 8. Percentage Distribution of Number of Weeks Unemployed.

Number of Weeks Unemployed	Employees (116)	Terminals (37)
0	10.3	13.5
1-19	84.5	75.7
20-39	5.2	5.4
40-52	0.0	5.4

Previous Annual Income

Previous annual income for those who stayed at least six months was $270 higher than for those who terminated (Table 9). Median family income for both LTV groups fell below the median family income of the supply area. Even with the higher calibre individuals and higher paid employees, the previous average income

was under $3,000 for about two thirds of the relocatees, with a higher proportion becoming terminals. These data seem to indicate that the lowest income families find it more difficult to relocate.

Table 9. Percentage Distribution by Individual and Family Income.

	Employees (116)	Terminals (37)	South Texas Census Data* (77,201)
Individual Total Income			
Under 3000	60.3	73.0	
3000-4999	35.3	27.0	
5000-6999	4.3	0.0	
7000 or more	0.0	0.0	
MEDIAN	$2658	$2388	
Family Total Income			
Under 3000	56.9	67.6	51.8
3000-4999	37.1	24.3	20.4
5000-6999	6.0	5.4	6.8
7000 or more	0.0	0.0	21.0
MEDIAN	$2766	$2496	$2893

*Based on 1959 annual income.

Housing Arrangements

The ability to find satisfactory housing is positively correlated with "successful" relocation (Ruesink and Kleibrink, 1969). It seems plausable that those persons buying a home in the Valley prior to relocation would be more likely to return. However, the data show a considerably higher percentage of the employees than the terminals owned or were buying homes in the Valley (Table 10). On the other hand, a greater percentage of terminals than employees lived rent free. Terminals report that payment of rent causes their real "take home" pay to be less than the money realized from lower paying jobs.

Table 10. Percentage Distribution by Type of Housing Arrangements Prior to Relocation.

Housing Arrangement	Employees (116)	Terminals (37)
Own home outright	6.9	5.4
Buying home (mortgage)	14.7	8.1
Renting or leasing	24.1	18.9
Rent free	52.6	64.9
Other	1.7	2.7

Community Size Preference

Prior to relocation, the relocatees indicated a preference for living in a particular size community. Little difference is found between community preferences of employees and terminals (Table 11).

Table 11. Percentage Distribution of Preference for Size Community.

Community Size	Employees (116)	Terminals (37)
Large City (250,000 or more)	12.9	13.5
Smaller City (10,000-250,000)	54.7	45.9
Small town (less than 10,000)	19.8	24.3
On a Farm	6.0	5.4
No Preference	14.7	8.1

Conclusion

In conclusion, it appears that of all external factors considered, certain of those related to socioeconomic status (SES) are most closely associated to successful relocation. Factors analyzed in this study which are normally considered to be indicators of SES included education, occupation, income, and material wealth.

Educational level is one of the best indicators of ability to relocate. Major relocation projects would be best directed at those persons with 12 or more years of education. Previous occupation can be used as a predictor of ability to relocate but not necessarily in relation to SES. The data here show that those individuals who have had previous experience in fields related to the job in the new area tend to relocate with greater permanence.

Though often used as a measure of SES, previous annual income as a predictor becomes difficult to evaluate for this group. The extremely low income, not only for the relocatees but for the entire supply area, makes it difficult to distinguish differential points. Even so, the lowest income families who relocated tended to leave the demand area sooner.

The only measure of material wealth available was home ownership. More of those owning homes prior to relocation are still in the demand area. Previous housing arrangements evidently have predictive value as an external factor. Those persons accustomed to making monthly payments for housing tend to relocate more easily than those living rent free.

The major conclusion that can be drawn is that selected external factors are usable as predictors of ability to relocate, but conclusions based on a priori conditions are at best tentative. The multifaceted complexity of adjustment must also take into consideration the social impacts of retraining and relocation. A longitudinal, 24 month study is being conducted in order to analyze the total adjustment process for relocated workers and their families.

Questions for Additional Research

Even though there are external factors that can be used as predictors of ability to relocate, there are a number of questions still unanswered:

1. How are internal factors associated with ability to relocate?

   A number of theories on attitudes and values could be tested in relation to this question. These might produce more reliable predictors than external factors.

2. What would happen if there were a screening program and those deemed least desirable were included in the project?

   This might influence the unemployment picture more. It would make a considerable difference on the overall evaluation or definition of "success".

3. On what basis is success to be determined?

   It would appear that a certain amount of stable employment already existed for the LTV relocatee. The results show that for the most part these relocatees simply shifted from one type of employment to another. Their take home pay improved considerably, but so did their cost of living. The exact net increase is yet to be calculated.

4. What was the effect on unemployment in the supply area?

   While it is difficult to determine what the unemployment would have been without the project, unemployment figures do not indicate that much influence was felt. See Table 12.

Table 12. Unemployment in the Supply Area.*

Date	Brownsville Harlingen San Benito		McAllen Pharr Edinburg	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
October, 1966	3,250	6.8	2,960	5.3
January, 1967	2,790	5.9	3,590	5.8
October, 1968	2,830	6.0	2,900	5.6
January, 1969	2,730	5.6	3,560	5.2

*Texas Manpower Trends, Texas Employment Commission.

5. How much assistance is provided for unemployed migrant workers?

   On the basis of information available, a longer work history than is now available would be needed in order to determine whether these relocatees have ever been migrants. They certainly were not when the last regular employment prior to training is considered.

6. Which is more feasible -- to move people or relocate industry?

   When families have roots well established in a geographical area, what are the social, political, economic and psychological costs involved with moving people compared to moving factories? Some basic research is needed in order to determine the consequences associated with the selection of one alternative over the other.

REFERENCES

Montross, Harold K. (1968), Moving to Work (Washington, D.C.: United States Employment Service, Bureau of Employment Security, Labor Mobility Services Unit, July 1967-February 1968).

Omari, Thompson P. (October 1956), "Factors Associated with Urban Adjustment of Rural Southern Migrants." Social Forces, Vol. 35, pp. 47-53.

Ruesink, David C. and T. Brice Batson (February 1969), "Success Factors in a Retraining-Relocation Program Involving Mexican Americans." Association of Southern Agricultural Workers Proceedings.

Ruesink, David C. and Michael C. Kleibrink (May 1969), "Mexican Americans from the Rio Grande Valley to Ling Temco Vought." Industrial Relations Research Association Spring Meeting Proceedings.

Shannon, Lyle W. and Kathryn Lettau (September 1963), "Measuring the Adjustment of In Migrant Laborers." Southern Social Science Quarterly, Vol. 44, pp. 139-148.

Upham, W. Kennedy and David E. Wright (September 1966), "Poverty among Spanish Americans in Texas: Low-Income Families in a Minority Group." Texas A&M Agricultural Experiment Station Departmental Information Report 66-2.

U.S. Bureau of the Census (1963), U.S. Census of Population, 1960, Vol. 1, "Characteristics of the Population," Part 45, Texas. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.